

### REMARKS

Claims 2, 4-6, 9, 11, 12, and 14-26 are in this application and are presented for consideration. Claims 5, 9, 16 and 18 have been amended, and new claims 20-26 have been added.

The claims have been amended to address the Examiner's rejections, to place the application in better form, and to further highlight and more clearly point out the important features of the invention.

The claims have been rejected as being obvious over applicants disclosed prior art (ADPA) in view of Kowalski '074. The rejection states that it would have been obvious to modify the ribs of ADPA by making the sawtooth components slideable using structure taught by Kowalski in order to allow the user to adjust the spacing between the sections of the cover.

Applicant has reviewed the applied prior art and finds no disclosure which would lead a person to make the sawtooth components of ADPA slidable. ADPA does not provide any indication that slidable sawtooth components are desirable. Instead ADPA teaches a solid rib, where the sawtooth components are made in one piece with the rib so that everything is fixed and solid. There is no indication in ADPA that slidable sawtooth components would be desirable. Furthermore, Kowalski also does not indicate that slidable sawtooth components would be desirable. Therefore the prior art does not provide the incentive for slidable sawtooth components, and a person of ordinary skill would not be led by the prior art to make slidable sawtooth components.

It is only the present application which discloses slidable sawtooth components, and

provides structure enabling this. It appears that the rejection is benefitting from hindsight, since it is only the present invention that indicates that slidable sawtooth components are desirable. The rejections are untenable since there is no incentive in the prior art to combine the references as indicated in the rejection.

It appears that the rejection has only found the slidable parts of applicant's invention in an unrelated field and then combined that with ADPA because that would give the benefit described in the present application. However an obviousness rejection requires more than just finding the parts of applicant's invention to come up with the benefits stated by the applicant. Instead there must be a reason why it would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill to put the combination together. Applicant finds no reason why the slidable feature would have been obvious to person of ordinary skill.

A person familiar with ADPA would not be given any reason to make the sawtooth components slidable. In fact, making the sawtooth components slidable would require much more effort and complication. Instead of just casting the rib in one piece from metal or plastic, or cutting the rib from a piece of blank stock, the present invention teaches making a plurality of small individual parts and then assembling them, which makes the rib more complicated. Therefore the reason for the slidable feature in this rejection must come from someplace other than ADPA. However this reason for a slidable fixture is not found in the other reference of Kowalski, and the rejection does not specifically indicate where this reason for the obviousness of the slidable feature can be found. Without a reason why person of ordinary skill in the art would expect that the benefits would occur, the rejection is untenable. The claims therefore

define over the applied prior art because a person of ordinary skill would have no indication that the combination would be obvious.

Claims 5, 9 and 18 have been amended to set forth that the transverse partition is arranged at the channel diametrically opposite to the slot. One embodiment of this feature is shown in present figures 7 and 8. The transverse partition is shown by reference 32B, and is diametrically opposite the slot 32A with respect to the channel 32E. In the prior art of Kowalski, elements 11a and 11b are not diametrically opposite slot S with respect to channel 5. Therefore elements 11a, 11b do not anticipate the transverse partition of claims 5, 9 and 18. These claims therefore further define over the prior art.

New claims 20 and 24 set forth that the transverse partition defines a hole receiving the screw of the sawtooth component. One embodiment of this is shown in present figures 7-9, with the hole being represented by 32H. Applicant finds no teaching nor suggestion of a hole in a transverse portion in Kowalski, and therefore claims 20 and 24 further define over the prior art.

Claims 21 and 25 set forth that the screw is directly fastened to the transverse partition. One embodiment of this is shown in present in figure 8. Applicant finds no teaching nor suggestion in Kowalski of a screw directly fastened to a transverse partition, and therefore claims 21 and 25 further define over the prior art.


One embodiment of the features of claim 22 is shown in present figure 10, with the screw engaging with the nut to press a screw against the transverse partition. Applicant finds no teaching nor suggestion in Kowalski of this feature, and therefore claim 22 further defines over the prior art.

Claims 23 and 26 set forth that the structural component defines another channel on a side of the transverse partition diametrically opposite from the channel. One embodiment of this feature is shown in figure 9, where the nut 142 is in the another channel and the appendage 134G is in the original channel. Applicant finds no teaching nor suggestion of all the features of claims 23 and 26 in Kowalski, and therefore these claims further define over the prior art.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions which would further favorable prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact applicant's representative by telephone to discuss possible changes.

At this time applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application, and based on the above amendments and remarks, respectfully solicits allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted  
for Applicant,



By: \_\_\_\_\_

Theobald Dengler  
Registration No. 34,575  
McGLEW AND TUTTLE, P.C.

TD:tf  
71633-9

Attached: Petition for One Month Extension of Time

DATED: July 26, 2007  
BOX 9227 SCARBOROUGH STATION  
SCARBOROUGH, NEW YORK 10510-9227  
(914) 941-5600

SHOULD ANY OTHER FEE BE REQUIRED, THE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE IS HEREBY REQUESTED TO CHARGE SUCH FEE TO OUR DEPOSIT ACCOUNT 13-0410.